



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,895	11/30/2005	Johannes Bergmann	2003P07420WOUS	4666
22116	7590	12/07/2010	EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			WYLIE, CHRISTOPHER T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2465			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/07/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/558,895	Applicant(s) BERGMANN ET AL.
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER T. WYLLIE	Art Unit 2465

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2010.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2010 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS-68)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other:

DETAILED OFFICE ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication received September 21st, 2010.

Claim 4 has been amended. Claim 4 has been entered and is presented for examination.

2. Application 10/558,895 claims priority to German Application 103 24 603.7 (05/30/2004) and is a 371 of PCT/EP04/50948 (05/24/2004).

3. Applicant's arguments, filed September 21st, 2010, have been fully considered, but deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection which has been necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Foreign Priority

5. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golden et al. (US 6,563,793) in view of Hackney (US 7,359,984)

Regarding claim 4, Golden et al. discloses a method for relaying packets to an external control component assigned to a network node in a communication network (**column 5, lines 42-45 [the enhanced switches detect packets the include requests for reserved connection according to RSVP]**), the communication network having a plurality of network nodes and switching packets (**see Figure 11**), the method comprising: receiving an in-band signaling packet at an external interface of a plurality of external interfaces of the network node (**see Figure 7 [the figure shows that each switch has multiple interfaces that are used to receive in-band control requests]**); connecting the external interface to the external control component (**see Figure 7 [the enhanced switches are connected to the ECP 50 via a channel]**); identifying the packet as an RSVP (Resource Reservation Protocol) type of packet(**column 5, lines**

42-45 [the enhanced switches detect packets the include requests for reserved connection according to RSVP]). Golden et al. is silent regarding modifying a DSCP (Differentiated Services Code Point) field in the header of the packet as a function of the receiving external interface, wherein the DSCP field contains the value uniquely assigned to the receiving external interface; and based on the value uniquely assigned to the receiving external interface, identifying which external interface of the plurality of external interfaces received the in-band IP signaling packet and routing the modified packet to the external control component connected to the external interface and thus relaying Internet Protocol (IP) packets to the external control component assigned to the network node. Hackney discloses such features (**column 2, lines 61-64 and column 3, lines 45-55, and column 4, lines 52-60 [Hackney discloses that the packet can be an IP packet; the DCHP field of the packet is modified to be used for a non-intended use; based on where the packet is to be routed, the source is inserted into the DSCP field of the message]).**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the method of Hackney into the system of Golden et al. The method of Hackney can be implemented by enabling the enhanced switches to modify the DSCP field of the IP packet to include the source. The motivation for this is to indicate to the ECP from which source the packet was received.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments, filed September 21st, 2010, have been fully considered, but deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejection which has been necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER T. WYLLIE whose telephone number is (571) 270-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 6:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher T. Wyllie/
Examiner, Art Unit 2465

/Jayanti K. Patel/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2465